

summary, it is assumed that it was the usual three months to and including February 27, 1999. Should such request or fee be deficient or absent, consider this paragraph such a request and authorization to withdraw the appropriate fee under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 from Crowe & Dunlevy Deposit Account No.: 13-0110.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully respected.

I. AMENDMENT

Cancel claims 30-32.

Please amend claims 1, 2, 22 and 25 as follows:

Sub B1
a1
5 1. (Amended) A method for therapeutically applying NO, the method comprising [combining a nitrite salt, a biocompatible reductant and an acid with a pKa between about 1 and about 4 in a medium and] topically applying [said combination] a composition comprising a nitrite salt, a biocompatible reductant and an acid with a pKa between about 1 and about 4 in a diffusion inhibiting medium to a body site in an amount effective to enhance local blood flow.

5 2. (Amended) A method for topical delivery of nitric oxide (NO) comprising [mixing a powdered nitrite salt with a powdered reductant and an acid having a pKa between about 1 and about 4 in a diffusion-inhibiting topically applicable medium and topically applying an effective amount of said mixture] applying an effective amount of a composition comprising a powdered nitrite salt, a powdered reductant, and an acid

contd A1
having a pKa between about 1 and about ~~4~~ in a diffusion-inhibiting medium to a body site.

A2
Set B27
22. (Amended) A composition for generating and controlling the release rate of NO for topical applications, ~~the composition~~ comprising a first aqueous gel and a second aqueous gel, the first gel comprising a nitrite salt, and the second gel comprising an acid having a pKa between about 1 and about 4 and at least one and at least one of the first and second gel comprising a reductant.

A3
15
~~25.~~ (Amended) The composition of claim ~~22~~ *12* where [thewhere] the acid is an organic acid.

II. RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-11 were thought to be improper hybrid claims with both the method of preparation and method of use set forth. Claims 22-29 were thought indefinite because a single composition was set forth in the preamble and the body of the claim describes two compositions. Claims 1-32 were thought to lack support in the specification and as not enabled. Claims 30-32 were viewed as undescribed and overly broad. The Smith et al. reference was cited to show the state of the art.

Independent method claims (1-2) are amended herewith to make them further